to the signal strength problems that prior inventions sought to overcome with multiple repeaters, Burns states:

> "Attempts have been made to overcome this disadvantage by using radio repeaters to relay messages from outlying transmitters to a central receiver, but these have generally not been successful because the messages from the repeaters and the transmitters share the same frequency channel and may clash" (column 1, lines 24-32).

Burns specifically introduces delays in his repeaters to avoid "clashing" of signals from multiple repeaters at the same time at any receiver.

We submit that this contrary teaching in Burns overcomes the examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 7, and that claims 1 and 7 are therefore patentable as they stand.

Claim rejections under USC Section 103(a):

The examiner rejects claims 2, 4, and 6 as being unpatentable over Burns (US Patent 5,129,096) in view of Bassirat (US Patent 6,507,741). Since claims 2, 4, and 6 are both dependent claims which depend on claim 1, the examiner's grounds for rejecting claims 2, 4, and 6 are predicated upon the examiners Section 102 rejection of claim 1, which we submit we have overcome above. We therefore submit that claims 2, 4, and 6 are patentable as they stand.

The examiner rejects claims 3 and 5, as being unpatentable over Burns (US Patent 5,129,096) in view of Marko et al. (US Patent 6,347,216). Since claims 3 and 5 are both dependent claims which depend on claim 1, the examiner's grounds for rejecting claims 3 and 5 are predicated upon the examiners Section 102 rejection of claim 1, which we submit we have overcome above. We therefore submit that claims 3 and 5 are patentable as they stand.

The examiner rejects claim 15 as being unpatentable over Bassirat (US Patent 6,507,741) in view of Burns (US Patent 5,129,096), reasoning that it would be obvious to combine the time digitizing and retransmitting features of Bassirat with the delay feature of Burns "to provide receiver-transmission with alternate paths being provided to guard against the message being lost (as suggested by Burns, abstract)."

We submit that Burns teaches way from such a combination, because one fundamental way that Burns guards against the message being lost is to insure that no two repeaters re-transmit to the same receiver such that their retransmitted signals arrive at that receiver at the same time, and the present invention, on the contrary, seeks to have multiple signals arrive at the same time, so well aligned in time in fact that the signal-to-noise ration of the resultant received signal can be increased by summing signals from different repeaters (as opposed to the loss of signal that would be experienced in systems known in the art.

Allowed Subject Matter:

The examiner has allowed claims 16-22. We wish to have these claims issued. We also wish to have claims 1-7 and 15 issued if the examiner so allows after considering the above arguments.

If the examiner wishes to discuss this response letter by telephone, at his convenience he may contact Lee Weinstein at (781)643-3281.

Sincerely

Lee Weinstein, Registration #56,261

Certificate of express mailing: I certify that this document including the attached amended claims and copy of the related office action were deposited with the US Postal Service as Express Mail, post office to addressee, April 4, 2009, express mail label number EH289273065US.

Lee Weinstein